

# Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2028

---

## **Initial Comments of the Independent Examiner**

**Prepared by**

**JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI**

**John Slater Planning Ltd**

**18<sup>th</sup> February 2018**

## Introduction

1. As you will be aware I have been appointed to carry out the examination of the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan. I have carried out my initial review of the Plan and most of the accompanying documents that I have been sent. I carried out my site visit to the parish on 2Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019.
2. My initial view is that I should be able to deal with the examination of this Plan by the consideration of the written material but I reserve the right to call for a public hearing, if I consider that it will assist my examination. Based on my preliminary consideration of the plan, there are a small number of matters that I would wish to receive further representations or comments, from either or both the Parish Council and Rother District Council.

## Reg 16 Comments

3. The Parish Council will not have had an opportunity to comment on any of the representations received as part of the Regulation 16 Consultation. If the Parish Council would wish to put forward suggestions, for amendments to the plan document, having considered the comments, then this is an opportunity to ask me to recommend them. I would be happy to consider any revisions etc., albeit that my remit is restricted to matters of the basic conditions.

## Local Green Space

4. The Planning Practice Guidance states that the landowners of sites that are proposed for designation as Local Green Space should be notified. Can the Parish Council confirm to me that this notification has taken place? Are there copies of correspondence I could see?

## Green Gaps

5. I note that the various areas shown as green gaps, on Maps 5-9 include residential curtilages and commercial premises e.g. public houses, hotel, a hospital and golf courses etc. Is the intention of Policy R2 to resist **all** development other than essential utility infrastructure within the green gaps? Is the desire to prevent residential extensions or other ancillary buildings associated with existing developed sites, or possibly replacement buildings or is the intention to retain as undeveloped any open fields? In the latter case what is the intention regarding agricultural buildings? Is it the intention that this policy should override a presumption in favour of development that is allowed by virtue of Policy H1 3)? I would ask the Parish Council, why it does not consider the existing local plan policies protects the countryside adequately in these gaps. If the intention is to not prevent extensions etc., is there a revised wording to Policy R2 that the Parish Council would like to suggest?

6. Is there an equivalent policy covering the land in Etchingam parish that would be complementary to the aspiration to prevent the coalescence of Ticehurst and Stonegate?
7. I would ask Rother District Council why it supports a strategic gap between Flimwell and Ticehurst but not measures to prevent coalescence with other villages?

### **SIngehurst**

8. I am conscious that there was an appeal decision APP/U1430/W/16/ 3150796 which dismissed an appeal by Rydon Homes for the development of this site, particularly because of the impact on the listed buildings in the vicinity. I would like to offer the Parish Council the opportunity to make additional representations and in particular, whether there has been a change in circumstances since that decision which would now render the residential development of this site, acceptable. I acknowledge that it may be that the community's support for this site could be such a change but I need to test the allocation in terms of meeting the basic conditions.
9. Would the District Council's view be different if the western allocation boundary was moved eastwards to create a larger buffer area to the listed buildings, thereby not so impacting on their setting to the same extent?

### **Final Matters**

10. In order, not to unnecessarily delay progress on this examination, I would welcome responses to these questions, **by 5pm on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2019**, if possible.
11. Please can both parties place a copy of this document and their responses on both the District Council's and the Parish Council's respective websites.